



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

“THE LESSER MAN.”

BY G. G. BUCKLER.

“Woman is the lesser man, and all thy passions matched with mine
Are as moonlight unto sunlight, and as water unto wine.”

OF all the opposition which new womanhood has had to encounter, perhaps the most formidable, because the most epigrammatically expressed, has been that of the poet Tennyson. His famous passage in the “Princess” has moved, if not convinced, thousands of readers, and the often-quoted comparison between man and woman in “Locksley Hall” is now taken as a heading, because it may truly be said to go straight to the heart of the woman question. This great subject, which almost since the world began has been calling forth a steady stream of learning, wit, eloquence, or bitterness, has been of recent years so thoroughly canvassed that no new view could even be attempted. It is therefore merely proposed here to state as shortly as possible the various aspects of the controversy, and the practical treatment hitherto given to each.

It may fairly be said that the whole subject of woman’s powers groups itself round four questions :

(1.) Is woman mentally and bodily fitted to engage in the higher branches of literature, science, and art ?

(2.) Is it for the good of the community that she should engage in these higher branches ?

(3.) Has she ever produced, or is she likely to produce, anything first-rate in these higher branches ?—a question leading to the fourth and final one,

(4.) What is woman’s proper sphere ?

These four great problems in their turn resolve themselves, the first into a question of physiology, the second into a question of ethics or rather of sentiment, and the third and fourth into

questions of historic fact on the one side and individual opinion on the other. In order to deal with the whole subject fairly, each point must be taken up in order.

(1.) Has woman adequate sinews and adequate brains? The first part of this enquiry, relating to physical strength, would seem to have been satisfactorily answered by the statistics proving the excellent health of college students and other workers, apart from the fact that few intellectual callings need special force of muscle. The second question has met with more varied and conflicting responses. From the two physical facts, that the female brain is different in shape and inferior in absolute though not in relative weight to the male, and that these divergencies increase with the development of the individual or the race, diametrically opposite inferences have been drawn. The progressive party base on them their assertion that weight of brain is no test, enforcing their argument by pointing to the massive skulls of elephants, or the inequality in this respect of two equally intellectual male brains, and insist that such physical differences are merely accidental. Their opponents, on the other hand, see in these conjoined facts the clearest proof that the proper tendency of evolution is to put man increasingly above woman in the sphere of mind. Even the question of a woman's capacity to learn, no less than that of her fitness to achieve, has met with widely different answers from various competent authorities, and whereas one pronounces her unable to amass knowledge like an adult man, a second bravely asserts that "there is absolutely no difference in the average intellectual capacity of the sexes," while a third goes so far as to wish that young men would learn from young women how to learn.

(2.) Such being the diversity of opinion, it would be an easy solution to give woman the benefit of the doubt and let her test her fitness by actual experiment, were it not for the second and ethical question—the effect on the community. Public sentiment has indeed led the question of higher education for women through many curious phases, and there has hardly been an age when the subject has not been discussed. The cultivated Athenians held up as an ideal before their wives and sisters and daughters to stay at home and keep silence and to be least spoken of among men. Hating clever women, as Euripides frankly

admits, they tolerated female learning and art only among the foreign courtesans. Plato, indeed, dreamed in his ideal Republic of women trained with men in gymnastics and music, and declared that “the gifts of nature are equally diffused in both sexes, and all the pursuits of men are the pursuits of women also,” but the small effect produced by his teaching and that of Aristotle after him can be best estimated when we remember the terrible fate of the learned Hypatia even in late Alexandrian days. The just-minded Romans were notoriously repressive to their womankind, and when we turn to Oriental races we find a prevalent contempt for the sex as rational beings. Christianity, teaching of God born of a human mother, opened a new era of respect and esteem for women, and their position was further improved by the rise in Europe of the Teutonic tribes, who revered them, and of the age of chivalry, which exalted them even to absurd pre-eminence. Of all this the worship of the Virgin Mary was one symptom; the splendor and importance of nunneries was another. In the Middle Ages women in their own homes were kept severely in hand, but among the nuns freedom reigned, and learning was accordingly cultivated to a surprising extent. Their course of study was identical with that of the monks, embracing profane as well as Christian literature, medicine as then understood, and the arts of the copyist and missal-painter. Chaucer’s Abbess, with her bad French and excellence only in table manners, is no fair specimen. It was no uncommon thing to find a nun composing verse, or writing learnedly of drugs and simples, and the names of Hrotsvitha and Herrad will always be famous, the first for her Latin plays in imitation of Terence, and the second for her attempted Encyclopedia.

The causes for the decline of feminine culture, at the very period of the Renaissance, when masculine culture took, as it were, a fresh lease of life, were manifold, but it will be enough to mention two. The spread of the feudal system gradually debarred the nunneries from holding land and thus deprived them of much political and social importance, while the laxity of tone at the rising universities kept women from sharing in their privileges with the promising pupils sent thither by the monasteries, and a growing feeling that a study of anatomy was essential closed to them on the same moral or fastidious grounds all avenues of art. As the convents declined as centres of learning, so

necessarily did feminine culture in all its branches, and in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries it was only rich women who could study at all. Boys could go to free schools and then to universities, but girls had to study expensively at home under the chaplain or visiting tutors, or at the even more costly private schools, such as the singularly ambitious one kept by Mrs. Makin, formerly governess to the daughter of Charles I. The account given by Pepys of his difficulties in teaching his wife arithmetic speaks for itself, and Queen Elizabeth was considered an infant prodigy because at nine she could read and write.

It must be remembered that Luther's emphatic assertion of marriage as the only true feminine vocation tended to aggravate this state of things in Protestant countries. In Catholic Italy, France, and Spain we find not only women writers and artists, but even female professors of rhetoric, Greek, Latin, natural philosophy, and mathematics, while in France particularly the ladies of the *salons* exercised an incalculable influence on literature, philosophy, and politics. With regard to the woman question in its later developments, it is curious how soon Spain began to retrograde. Even in the 18th century we learn that Spanish girls were not taught their alphabets for fear they might correspond secretly with their sweethearts, and at the present day not only is all feminine study at universities forbidden as in Austria by law, but there is among the women little opportunity and still less desire for any intellectual occupation other than literature or journalism. France and Italy, on the other hand, have been consistently moderate if not progressive. In France the first prize given for eloquence at the newly instituted Academy was awarded to Mlle. de Scudéry, and in our days the admission of women to university study has been most pacifically accomplished, indeed welcomed by the Republican government as an offset to conventual education. In Italy we find Laura Bassi gaining a doctor's degree at Bologna as early as 1752, and a chair in the same university is now held by a woman, while the whole question of higher education for women may be said to have been thoroughly threshed out at Padua in 1723. On that occasion a certain Professor Camposampiero claimed for the weaker sex those opportunities which in his opinion the stronger only monopolized from mean and tyrannical motives; Professor Volpi deprecated the physical and mental fatigue of study for

women, as tending to check marriage or make insubordinate wives, and as making those who indulged in it "ill, weary, and contrary;" and the President concluded, without deciding, the discussion by reminding the assembly of Plato's aphorism that women were not all alike.

Turning to the history of higher education in England, we find that she has mightily advanced from her position in the days of Pepys, or even 150 years ago, when Dr. Johnson could say that among women "any acquaintance with books was distinguished only to be censured," and could himself, though a champion of progressive views, pronounce feminine painting of portraits impossible, on the ground that it would be "highly indelicate for a female" to gaze into the face of a male sitter. The new era may be said to date from Mary Godwin's "Vindication of the Rights of Women," published in 1791, and followed not many years later by Sydney Smith's liberal and trenchant essays. His arguments may still be cited as the basis of the modern woman's plea, proving as they do that feminine education tends to deepen every mother's influence on her children, to elevate marriage into a higher form of companionship, and to assist public morals by giving the wife an influence independent of mere youth and beauty. The leaven of this new idea was, however, slow in operation, and when higher education for women became an actual fact, the honor must be given not to Old England but to the New.

Of all branches of feminine learning, medicine has probably been the most discussed. In all ages women have compounded drugs, and from mediæval nuns down to Florence Nightingale there has been no lack of female nurses; but regular women doctors are an outcome of recent times. To the well-worn arguments of the overtaxing or unsexing effect on women of medical work, it is only fair to oppose the actual results of experience on the one hand, and on the other, the reminder that the argument of delicacy works both ways, so that in the seventeenth century a "man midwife" was regarded as no less unsexed than a "woman doctor" in the early days of the nineteenth. As far as facts are concerned, it is perhaps unnecessary to state that the first woman doctor, Miss Elizabeth Blackwell, after struggling for many years against straitened circumstances and persistent opposition, at length graduated from the Medical Col-

lege of Geneva, N. Y., in the year 1849. That same year Boston started a special medical college for women, and in 1863 and 1864 Paris and Zurich opened their doors to feminine students of medicine, but it was not till 1865 that the first Englishwoman, Miss Garrett (now Dr. Garrett Anderson), succeeded in forcing the London Society of Apothecaries to grant her a doctor's certificate. After this, opposition was slowly conquered in England, and in 1893 we find there 8 medical schools for women, several important institutions carried on entirely by women, and 6 degree-giving bodies willing to examine and certificate feminine applicants—though even now English women as physicians and surgeons number little more than 100, against 4,555 in the United States. In Russia the history of medical education has been even more curious. In 1862 Mme. Souslowa obtained leave to study medicine in St. Petersburg, and worked undisturbed for two years. Suddenly there was issued an ukase closing all university doors to female students, and alleging that “women did better as such when they knew nothing and understood nothing.” Yet when Mme. Souslowa had graduated at Zurich, she was allowed to practise medicine at home, and at this moment there are not only numbers of Russian students at the medical schools in Paris and elsewhere, but actually from 700 to 800 women graduates of foreign universities practising in Russia itself. In Germany, where all universities are professedly closed to women, no woman can practice medicine without special authorization, and the state of affairs is even more retrograde in Austria and Spain. Of all spheres open to women doctors, perhaps the largest is that in India among its secluded ladies, but there the climate, the poor pay, and the prevalent distrust of medical aid present peculiar difficulties, which can probably be best solved by the increasing study of medicine in England and elsewhere by native Indian women.

In other branches of higher education, America again takes the lead. Vassar College was founded in 1865, four years before Girton, the first English institution of the kind. Since then, the doors of the greater proportion of universities, both in the United States and in Europe, have been opened to women, who are taught and examined on various terms, and in most cases can obtain degrees, while in this country as early as 1888, out of 389 degree-giving bodies, 237, including all the State universities,

were distinctly co-educational. From all these places women issue every year armed with degrees or certificates in every branch of learning—science, mathematics, languages, philosophy, theology, law, and so forth—a curious commentary on the doctrine of the 18th century Frenchwomen, that women ought to shrink as modestly from learning as from vice. The after careers of college students have led to much compilation of statistics. In Great Britain, to quote from a table drawn up from 1869 to 1895, of 1,486 such students 268 (or about one-seventh) have married, 680 have become teachers, 50 secretaries, 11 doctors, and 2 nurses, while the rest have all engaged in philanthropic or missionary work, with the exception of 1 journalist, 1 bookbinder, 1 market-gardener, and 1 lawyer in Bombay. In the United States we find it stated in 1895 that over one-half of the women students marry, and two-thirds teach at least for a while after leaving college. Of the 200,000 and more female teachers in this country registered at the last census, 735 were professors of advanced branches of learning in women's colleges or co-educational institutions. Taking the statistics of Vassar College separately, we learn that of the 1,182 graduates about two-thirds are married, about one-third are teaching and one-ninth are pursuing individual research, while among the numbers are 1 bank director, 1 treasurer, 1 business manager, and 1 “major” in the Salvation Army. Outside of the college graduates, there are many thousands of women workers in the United States engaged in no less than 400 distinct professions. Of these, next to medicine and teaching, the law is perhaps the most distinctly intellectual. Curiously enough, we find the question of female admissibility to the bar first debated and decided negatively in Russia in the year 1875. This decree has been reversed in no countries except France to a limited extent, and more widely in the United States. There was a woman lawyer in Wisconsin at least as early as 1879, and recent statistics show that 120 women are now members of the bar and 8 have been admitted to the Supreme Court, and that 24 States allow female pleading. Turning to some of the other avocations, we find registered at the last census 1,235 women preachers and 4,875 public officials of various kinds, whereas it may surprise us to read of only 2,725 authoresses and 888 women in journalism, of whom, by the by, comparatively few are college bred. On

the other hand, nearly 50,000 women are engaged in teaching or producing music and art, and female painters outnumber the male. In England this is not yet the case, and the artistic energies of women are, on the whole, more directed to such art crafts as stained glass, china painting, wall papers, wood carving, metal-work for lamps and so forth, art needlework, book-binding, modeling in clay, and even house decoration and landscape gardening.

After this general survey of women's work, divided as it was in a recent book into the nine departments of Education, Literature, Journalism, Medicine (of course including surgery and dentistry), the Ministry, the Law, the State, Industry, and Philanthropy, it would seem that there is no walk of life which, in some quarter of the globe at least, is not open to them. Into the factory, into the world of business, politics, or sport, into haunts of learning or offices of state, they have gradually found their way. As far as sentiment and abstract justice are concerned, the movement has met with approval from almost all thoughtful people, and has shown itself to be antagonistic neither to sex distinctions nor to the teachings of Scripture. There is, however, an economical side of the question which must not be overlooked. The rush of women into professions, notably that of teaching, has overstocked the market and tended to reduce salaries, if not to lower the standard of excellence, an evil aggravated by the prevailing want of combination among the women workers themselves. The cheapness of female labor makes employers engage the wives and daughters and leave the men at home, and it is a historical fact that such a state of things leads always to the deterioration of a race. Again, the very physical differences between the sexes would seem to predestine them to different kinds of work, and the duties of maternity alone would prove that woman was not primarily created to be the bread winner. All this belongs properly to the question of woman's true sphere; here it will be enough to have sketched historically the varying attitudes assumed by men toward the intellectual aspirations of women.

(3.) We have now arrived at our third point; what have women made out of their opportunities? Have they ever achieved, or will they ever achieve, anything first-rate in literature, science, or art? The first half at least of the question admits of a decided

answer, and that answer is in the negative. Looking impartially at history we cannot claim that the widespread mental and artistic activity of women has in a single instance achieved anything absolutely first-rate, whether as creation or as discovery. This proposition must be discussed somewhat in detail.

Taking literature as our first topic, we find women from the earliest days expressing their thoughts in verse and prose. Yet as real poets we can only mention the half-mythical Sappho, and possibly in our own day Mrs. Browning and Christina Rossetti. Edmund Gosse has, indeed, emphatically asserted that women never have been or can be poets, because they lack the artistic impulse, and that the only possible exception to this rule lies in the realm of lyric poetry, which alone can be perfect without art. In prose we find the same absence of supreme excellence. No woman has ever written a great essay or a great history. Masculine production has been everywhere superior, except in the minor branches of letter-writing and novels of domestic life, with their special demand for the feminine qualities of quick emotions and ready observation. In dramatic literature no woman has gained for herself any lasting fame. Now, in the field of letters, at any rate, it cannot be claimed that woman has only just started. She has been writing for over 2,000 years and, broadly speaking, in every civilized country, even in Turkey and India, where her social position is most inferior; yet nowhere do we find her in the highest rank. Even the assumption of masculine *noms de plume* by so many authoresses points not so much to the desire for an impartial judgment from the public as to the dislike of each new aspirant to associate herself with the legions of female failures in literature. The want of closeness of grasp, want of balance, and want of precision in form, which characterize the writings of women, may be variously ascribed to lack of synthetic power, undue indulgence in the emotions, or imperfect training in the study of great models, but they are none the less incontestable. Whatever women may achieve in the future of letters, it is certain that in the past they have not attained an equal level with men, not even proportionally to the smaller number engaged in the attempt. They may, however, claim to have brought into literature, or intensified in it, two inestimable qualities, purity of sentiment without sentimentality, and breadth of human sympathy; and when we add to this their indirect influence on the

writings of men, we must concede to them great importance though not supreme excellence.

The same things might almost be said, word for word, about art. Neither the antagonism of society nor inherent difficulties in painting, sculpture, architecture, and music can be put forward as adequate excuses for the mediocrity of feminine achievement, and lack of training can no longer be urged. Yet in all days past or present, what woman has risen to the highest rank in art? Mme. Lebrun and Angelica Kauffmann owe their principal fame to the fact that as exceptionally charming women in an age of laxer artistic criticism they were employed to paint the portraits of all their most famous contemporaries, and in their work have curiously reflected the spirit of a bygone and deeply interesting period. Rosa Bonheur is indeed "the monarch of animal painters," but no one can deny that hers is at best an inferior sphere of art. In landscape painting feminine mediocrity has been so marked that it has led to the assertion that women have no real love for nature. In sculpture who would venture to class Sabina von Steinbach or Harriet Hosmer with a Phidias or a Michel Angelo? In the field of architecture women have, it is true, only just begun to appear, but in the ancient and far-reaching realm of music their achievements are no less meagre. With the exception of a few simple airs, and the much-discussed share of Fanny Mendelssohn in her brother's *Lieder ohne Worte*, we can hardly mention anything produced by female musicians. On the other hand, in the sphere of rendering music, a woman such as Jenny Lind has probably eclipsed all male competitors, just as in another secondary or imitative art the Mrs. Siddons' or Rachels of the world have gained a fame to which even Garrick and Booth cannot approach. Again, as writers about art, women have done good service, and we can hardly even estimate the debt of masculine music, painting, and sculpture to feminine inspiration; but as creative artists women hitherto have been conspicuous failures.

Before we pass on to the abstract sciences, a glance must be given to the departments of teaching, philanthropy, and medicine. It has been truly asserted that the two former have benefited enormously by the higher education of women. From classical days when Aspasia gave lectures and female philosophers discoursed to admiring pupils, there have always been women

teaching with success, and indeed the obligatory training of a child by its mother seems to point this out as natural feminine work. And thus it can be only a gain to humanity to have its women teachers every year more thoroughly educated, just as in philanthropic work the value of trained intelligence is increasingly recognized. In all the walks of medicine, woman's presence is now almost universally welcomed. The military authorities in the Crimea who opposed the arrival of Florence Nightingale and her fifty nurses were soon converted when they saw the reduction in the death rate and the improvement of moral tone in the army. In the Turkish war of 1877 and in the recent cholera times Russia owed much to her women doctors, and in all countries, particularly in India, the work of these women among their own sex has been of unspeakable value. In this country a famous doctor said of Dr. Susan Dimock, who died at 28, but had already become famous for her “skill and self-command in operating,” “I found her one of the most accomplished physicians I have met;” and there is a growing feeling that medical work in reformatories and insane asylums calls imperatively for women. In law, on the other hand, they have not worked long enough to be a fair subject for theories, and to theology and pulpit eloquence they cannot be said to have contributed anything whatsoever. In politics their power has been either exceptional, as in the case of queens, or indirect, as, for instance, in the old French *salons*, so that no general argument as to feminine capacity can fairly be adduced.

Turning to women in science—that is to say, to woman as an inventor and discoverer—we find more achievement of a distinctly high order, but the same absence of anything absolutely first-rate. In some branches, such as archæology, biology, chemistry, history, and philology, women have not worked in sufficient numbers to call for special attention. In philosophy they have translated and interpreted much, but originated nothing of consequence. In political economy Harriet Martineau herself recognized that she could “popularize but neither discover nor invent”; and the modern writer, Mrs. Fawcett, is chiefly known as her husband's collaborator and echo. In astronomy, however, there are several female claimants to fame. Hypatia, indeed, is known to us chiefly by tradition, and we have no positive proof that the astronomical tables inserted in her father's work are

rightly ascribed to her, so that she owes her reputation principally to her youth and beauty and pathetic fate. But, when we come to modern days, we must not overlook the indubitable discovery of five comets by Caroline Herschel, even if we think of her primarily as the devoted assistant and amanuensis of her greater brother, Sir William ; nor the valuable contributions made to astronomical science by Catherine Scarpellini ; nor the place filled in our own country by Maria Mitchell, not only as professor of astronomy at Vassar College, but as a staunch advocate and shining example of higher education for women. At the present moment the women engaged in this science are occupying humbler, but no less useful, positions, and, as assistants in observatories, are doing good service in the study of photographs under the microscope or in the observation of sun-spots and eclipses.

In physics and mathematics we find feminine enthusiasts at quite an early date. In the 18th century a work by Signora Agnesi, assistant professor of mathematics at Bologna, was translated by one of the greatest English mathematicians then living ; while at Voltaire's request Mme. du Châtelet published a French version of Newton's *Principia*. Early in this century Sophie Germain carried off a special scientific prize offered at Napoleon's suggestion by the Institute of France, and Mrs. Somerville was authorized by Laplace to make a condensed English reproduction of his *Mécanique Céleste*. Of this remarkable woman, Justin McCarthy could justly say that she "distinctly raised the world's estimate of woman's capacity for the severest and the loftiest pursuits," and we learn that her chief regret in dying, at the advanced age of 91, was that she had not lived to see ascertained the distance of the earth from the sun, and the true sources of the Nile. In our own day Miss Fawcett has shown much mathematical promise, and it is said by a competent judge that the work of Sonia Kovalevski, who died at 41 after gaining the Bordin Prize from the French Academy of Sciences, is of far higher grade than any as yet achieved by any American mathematician, astronomers possibly excepted. Yet taken all in all, these few individual instances of female achievement in science serve only to prove the rule that women as discoverers are inferior to men.

In the realm of invention the same statement holds good. In the earliest times, it is true, both the industrial arts and the spread of language were due to the women of a race, with their sedentary

lives and constant occasions for conversation and mechanical devices, rather than to their hunting and necessarily taciturn husbands and brothers. Tradition itself assigns to various women or goddesses the first introduction of agriculture, law, medicine, and the rudiments of learning, and history confirms such a belief. To two Chinese empresses we owe the art of spinning and the discovery of silk. A Greek woman gave us gauze, a Hindoo princess Cashmere shawls and attar of roses, and a Japanese woman the first relief work in bronze ever produced in her country. In later days Miss Betsy Metcalf originated the straw industry in the United States, and even if Eli Whitney and not Mrs. Greene devised the cotton gin, yet we find 3,458 indisputable feminine inventions registered at the United States Patent Office since its opening in 1790. On the whole, it is probably safe to say that no epoch-making invention has yet been produced by a woman, though as assistants in mechanical experiments women are preferred to men by no less an authority than Edison.

After this rapid survey of all possible branches of mental activity, one-half at least of our third question may be said to be answered. Women have never yet attained the highest rank in science, literature, and art. Whether they ever will do so is, of course, a matter of opinion, and here it is well carefully to discriminate facts from theories. When a distinguished critic asserts that women are fitted to excel in the arts of pleasing (such as dress and conversation) and of mere decoration, rather than in the fine arts proper, we may be inclined to agree with him, owing to historical experience. But we shall probably not admit as proof his arguments of doubtful relevancy and accuracy, such as the development of æsthetic taste in the male animal earlier than in the female, the effect of muscular weakness in precluding sympathy with an artist's own creations, and the comparative insensibility of women to love. Again, when Professor Romanes follows Darwin in putting down observation, reason, imagination, and invention as the qualities selected in man, and intuition, rapid perception, and possibly imitation as those selected in women, no one can venture to dissent; but when he proceeds to give supposed reasons, we listen with interest rather than conviction. According to him the intellectual inferiority of women is due, first to the preference of men who marry only the clinging and dependent among them and perpetuate these

traits in the race ; secondly, to the woman's physical weakness, inclining her to timidity, vacillation, and an absorbing desire to please ; thirdly, to the diversion of her energies and the over-stimulation of her emotions effected by maternal duties ; and, fourthly, to the comparative ignorance of life in which she is and should be brought up. No more satisfactory are the reasons alleged on the other side, such as the comparative recentness of women's attempts in literature, science, and art, the prejudice and opposition of men, and the influence of past centuries of imperfect education and inherited ignorance. Of these the first two are untrue or exaggerated, and the third must strike with surprise any person who reflects that women presumably inherit as much from their educated fathers and grandfathers as from their uneducated mothers and grandmothers. There seems more logical cogency in the arguments of a recent writer, who shrewdly asks : If women were ever intellectually equal to men, when and why did they begin to fall behind ? and if they never were equal, how can they hope to catch up now, when masculine education is advancing at as great a rate as feminine ?

(4.) There now remains only our fourth and last question, that of woman's proper sphere. Here again " who shall decide when doctors disagree ? " Basing all theories, however, on experience and history, as previously cited, we may perhaps assert tentatively a few propositions. In writing, women will be wise to recognize with George Eliot the fact of sex in literature, and realize that to write *as women* is the office they have to perform. *After their kind*, in her opinion, women can fully equal men. Probably woman's kind in literature will always be found to be the humbler species, the lyric, and especially the hymn, letter-writing, and domestic novels. In art she will do well to confine herself to the lower and no less useful branches, decoration, and the various art industries ; in music and drama she must be content with being indisputably a finer interpreter than man. In teaching, philanthropy, and medicine she can take an honorable place, and in religious work (apart from the vexed question of preaching) she will be universally welcomed. In the sciences of invention and discovery she had best not hope for great achievement, but be satisfied with a large arena of usefulness in assisting and carrying out the creations of men. For it is in this subordinate relation that women can probably find their truest and widest

sphere, that of Influence. It is the modern fashion to decry this power as degrading ; none the less it is a vitally important factor in human affairs. Buckle declares that in the modern world the spread of civilization and the influence of women have been commensurate. Not only on morals, he tells us, but on knowledge has this influence been of enormous importance, for it is women who encourage in men those processes of deduction and imagination which are foreign to the male nature. To the same secret but beneficent agency Mill ascribes the aversion of the world nowadays to war and its addiction to philanthropy. In whatever field of mental activity we look, women have from all time been the great inspirers and moulders of men. No one can mention Barak, Pericles, Dante, or Petrarch without thinking simultaneously of Deborah, Aspasia, Beatrice, or Laura. The finest compositions by Beethoven, Schumann, and Chopin would probably never have been written but for the women to whom they are dedicated, and the paintings of Andrea del Sarto and Titian show almost too plainly the earthly and feminine sources of their inspiration. The French Academy owes its birth to the female purists assembled in the Hotel de Rambouillet, and indeed throughout the history of French literature women seem to have abided by the famous advice of Lebrun : “Inspire, do not write.” In the various *salons* of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, literary, political, philosophical, semi-religious, or wholly revolutionary, a new French literature and philosophy, and above all, the spirit of a terribly new political age, may be said to have been cradled. Clubs have now arisen to draw men away from ladies’ drawing-rooms, and the power of the press has eclipsed that of any social circle, but none the less can women expect and claim a vital if subordinate or indirect share in all the activities of men.

To those who are not contented with this, we can only say: Take your own way. You are probably as well fitted as a man at least to *acquire* learning, and all opportunities are now open to you. But if in achievement you fail to attain the highest rank, do not be surprised, but look with more tolerant respect on the women who are satisfied to be and confess themselves the intellectual inferiors of men.

G. G. BUCKLER.